

January 6, 1984

LB 377

and I choose to have another physician do it or a physician do it, then I must call him from the station I suppose and have him come down there?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Now is the officer going to have to be there during all of this or can he go back out on the street and do his job.

SENATOR BEUTLER: No, the officer can go back out on the street I am sure. The man will be in custody so somebody will be there but the officer doesn't have to be there.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Okay, thank you,

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I had to accept this amendment in order to get the bill out here on the floor and Senator Beutler has completely and correctly explained the amendment but I want to tell you what my concern about the whole issue is. First of all, as Senator Beutler pointed out, the current law does, if a breath test is not to be taken, give the option of a urine or a blood test. That is already in the law. The second thing that already is in the law is that after the officer has administered his or her test, then the person has the option of seeking a physician to take the test and then have laboratory work done on it as he or she would choose. So all of that is in the law right now. The only thing I intended to do was to require the officer upon completion of the test that is given, so this doesn't interfere with anything that the officer does in taking the test so it can't delay the taking of the test so that the alcohol would be absorbed or whatever, immediately upon completion of the officer giving whatever tests are given to inform the individual of these options that are in the law right now and have been there for years. To not tell a person of rights that you have would prevent that person from intelligently waiving those rights. If you don't know you have it, why even put those rights into the law? So if